
Cisalpine Celtic varia I

CORINNA SALOMON

ABSTRACT: This article collects comments on different aspects—reading, segmentation, etymology, and interpretation—of six Cisalpine Celtic inscriptions: LexLep JU·1 **priś**, the recent finds NO·27 **komeuios** | **kalatiknos** and NO·28 **akluśamo** | **ualos** | **leukur** | **uritu**, VR·7 ATEPORIX, and BG·36.1/2 ACETABLA VIII | TAI.

KEYWORDS: Cisalpine Celtic, Lepontic, Cisalpine Gaulish, North Italic epigraphy, Gaulish onomastics

THE PURPOSE OF THE FOLLOWING six notes is to draw attention to a few new analyses and interpretations of Cisalpine Celtic inscriptions and the linguistic forms attested in them which have recently been implemented in the on-line edition *Lexicon Leponticum* (LexLep). The text is, in essence, drawn from the respective LexLep entries, but was adapted to the format of a print publication. Details about aspects of the inscriptions which are not discussed here, as well as images and further literature, can be found in the website's entries. The inscription sigla used are those of LexLep for Celtic inscriptions (type XX·1) and of ET² for Etruscan inscriptions; concordances of the LexLep sigla with the major print editions of the Cisalpine Celtic inscription corpus (Whatmough

Corinna Salomon [corinna.salomon@univie.ac.at] is a philologist and historical linguist with a research focus on alphabet history, fragmentary language studies, and pre-Roman epigraphy in Europe. She has contributed to the on-line editions of the North Italic inscription corpora *Lexicon Leponticum* and *Thesaurus inscriptionum Raeticarum*, and has published on Raetic and Cisalpine Celtic language and writing, the origin of the Runic script, and the Vinča signary. She is member of the international consortium AELAW—Ancient European Languages and Writings—and of the editorial team of the scientific journal *Die Sprache*.

North American journal of Celtic studies Vol. 6, No. 2 (Spring 2022)
Copyright © 2022 by The Ohio State University

1933; Tibiletti Bruno 1981; Solinas 1995; Motta 2000; Morandi 2004) are provided on <https://lexlep.univie.ac.at/wiki/Concordance>.

1. JU·1 priś (Montmorot; before second half of sixth century BCE)

The interpretation of this chronological and geographical outlier usually follows the original publications by Verger (1998a: 626–627 & 1998b: 285–288), who reads san as [ksj]. As evidence for san being employed to denote palatalised velar-sibilant clusters, Verger, following Lejeune 1971: 19, cites VB·27 **aśouni**, which is compared with isolated Gaul. AXIOVNO (CIL xii 3215)¹ by Lejeune 1971: 19 & 63²⁰⁰, and VB·3.1 **naśom** ‘Naxian’ in the reading of Lattes (cf. Lejeune 1971: 75). Dismissed by Lejeune 1971: 63¹⁹⁸, but reconsidered by Uhlich 2007: 385–386 is VB·2 **amaśilu** ~ Gaul. *ambact-* (under the assumption that *-xti- > *-xsi-).² All three putative examples date to ca. 100 BCE; while san in **naśom** is uncertain,³ the sound thought to be spelled with san in the personal names is not the palatalised velar-sibilant cluster, but a resulting assimilated dental sound which possibly fell together with the outcome of tau Gallicum contexts and thus came within the orthographic range of san. For **aśouni**, Stifter 2010: 372 proposes an alternative analysis **ad-omnos* as in OIr. *adomnán* ‘very fearsome’. Whether Lepontic san could, indeed, represent outcomes of palatalised velar-sibilant clusters, let alone the possibly original clusters in the sixth century BCE, is highly uncertain. In the earliest Lepontic attestations of san (CO·48 *siteś*, VA·6 *isós*), the letter is used for etymological dental-dental clusters (tau Gallicum context; see Stifter 2010: 367–374).⁴

The research was conducted for the project *Cisalpine Celtic Language and Literacy*, funded by the Austrian Academy of Sciences (APART fellowship 2019) and conducted at the Department of Linguistics of the University of Vienna. I am grateful to David Stifter (Maynooth) for his feedback and advice on linguistic matters, to Alex Mullen (Nottingham) for sharing her expertise on pottery lists, and to Joe Eska and two anonymous reviewers for their comments and useful additional references.

¹With base/first element **axso-* ‘sharp’ according to Luján 2003: 188–189, but the exact derivation of PIE **h₂ek-* to yield Gaul. *axsi-* (**h₂ek-s-i-*) is not securely attested in Celtic, see NIL 287–300 & 259–262, esp. 261¹⁰.

²Cf. Stifter 2010: 371 sub C, and on the even more doubtful option that san can denote a velar-sibilant cluster without palatalisation (371–382 sub E).

³Stifter 2011: 175–176²² argues conclusively for Latin <X> with a diacritic stroke.

⁴Like Verger, I assume as a working hypothesis in the following that the language of the inscription is Celtic because of its find place, though, due to the document’s isolation, it cannot be excluded that the text is non-Celtic, viz., most plausibly Etruscan. A Celtic form, as pointed out by Verger 2001: 288, can be Lepontic or of the local Gaulish dialect. A discussion of the question whether Lepontic in the sixth century BCE was a different language than Gaulish (e.g., Stifter 2020: 336) or not (e.g., Eska 1998a) can be omitted here, as it does not inform the issue.

I also assume, for argument’s sake, that the orthography of the inscription can be judged based on comparison with inscriptions in the Lepontic alphabet, though this is by no means evident, as the alphabet used in the inscription—Etruscan or Lepontic—is difficult to classify. The issue does not so much concern the letter forms, for which the question of alphabet ascription may be moot: when assuming that the Lepontic alphabet as it was used to write the Celtic language(s) of Northern Italy and the

Verger suggests that a sequence **brig-s-i-* from a base *brig-* ‘height’ could be an abbreviated personal name, comparing a Gaulish name element *brix-*. Apart from the precariously supported reading, there are multiple problems with this analysis. The element *brig-* in Gaulish personal names is not the ‘height’-root *brig-*,⁵ but *brig-* ‘worth’,⁶ which is generally assumed to underlie Gaulish compound names in *brigo-*, e.g., *brigo-*

Alpine region is derived directly from the Etruscan alphabet (thus, e.g., Verger 2001: 312–313; Gambari & Colonna 1988: passim; Maras 2014: 73–74; differently Rix 1997: 232; Eska 2017: 71–72), purely graphic features in the archaic alphabets are not reliably diagnostic. San M and rho P are not securely attested in Lepontic inscriptions (for potential—late—san M at Giubiasco, discounted as Latinised mu by Stifter 2010: 367 and at greater length in LexLep: <https://www.univie.ac.at/lexlep/wiki/Š>, see T1-5, T1-7, T1-9), but they are ultimately the predecessors of Lepontic M and P, and it cannot be excluded that the Lepontic alphabet in an early stage knew the archaic Etruscan letter forms. The analysis of the linguistic content, however, depends on whether the orthography is Etruscan or Celtic, in this inscription specifically with regard to san and pi. Due to the differences between the Etruscan and Celtic obstruent systems, pi can only represent /p/ if the orthography is strictly Etruscan; if the orthography is adapted to accommodate Celtic obstruents, it can represent Celtic /b/ as well as /p/ (if existent at that stage, see, e.g., Eska 1998b). The use of sibilants in the Lepontic alphabet is notable for following the Southern Etruscan rather than the Northern Etruscan pattern: san in Northern Etruscan inscriptions denotes /s/, while, in the Lepontic alphabet, sigma denotes /s/ at least since the mid-sixth century (NO-1), and san, at least since the late sixth century (CO-48, VA-6), is relegated to the spelling of other phonemes/clusters, the second Etruscan sibilant phoneme /ś/ ([ʃ] vel sim.) not existing in Celtic. Thus, if the orthography of the inscription is Etruscan, san probably denotes /s/ as in Northern Etruscan writing, but if it is adapted to writing Celtic, san denotes something else. A Celtic reading *pris* according to Northern Etruscan orthography has little to recommend it in terms of analysis and etymology (see below); the orthography, therefore, does appear to be adapted to the phonetics of the Celtic language written. Whether this makes the inscription’s alphabet ‘Lepontic’ remains open to debate. Verger 2001: 281–284 places the Montmorot inscription in the context of the spread of Etruscan literacy northward, arguing that it is evidence for the use of the archaic Etruscan alphabet to write Celtic before it took on the characteristics of the Lepontic alphabet. But does this mean that the inscription is part of the Lepontic writing tradition proper and documents a ‘proto-Lepontic’ state of affairs? This is not unlikely insofar as contacts between the area of Montmorot and the Golasecca culture are reflected in the archaeological finds of the late Hallstatt phase (Verger 2001: 297–306). Yet it cannot be excluded that the inscription represents an isolated attempt to write a Celtic text with the Etruscan alphabet with no direct connection to Lepontic literacy. Consequently, arguments for the sound value of san, whose Celtic application is non-obvious, in the inscription which are based on the letter’s function(s) in the Lepontic alphabet must be taken with a grain of salt.

⁵ PIE **b^hrǵh-*, PC **brig-* ‘height, mountain, fortress’. Attested in Celtic are the root noun PIE **b^hrǵh-s* > PC **brigs* in OIr. *brí* ‘hill’ and the derivation PIE **b^hrǵh-ah₂-* > PC **brigā* in MW, MBret., MCo. *bre* ‘hill’ (NIL 30; DLG 87; EDPC 77; LÉIA B-87; DTNG 152–153). Both forms appear as first and especially second element in numerous Continental Celtic toponyms, e.g., *brigaecium*, ἀροβρία, *eburobriga*, *aliobrix*, *castellum auiliobris* (Hamp 1991–1992; de Hoz 1994: 352–353; DLG 87; CD 4; DCCPN 11–12 & 80–81). Also amply attested is the participle in *-nt-*: PC **brigantī* (OIr. *brigid*, OBrit. theonym & Gaul. PN *brigantia*), **brigantinos* > MW *brenhin* ‘king’, and numerous Continental Celtic toponyms, hydronyms and ethnonyms in *brigant-* ‘elevated’ (DLG 87–88; Falileyev 2010: 12 & 80), as well as some other derivations (see NIL 31).

⁶ PC **brig-* ‘worth, honour’. Lexically in OIr. *bríg* < **brigā* ‘might, worth’, MW *bri* ‘honour, esteem’, MBret. *bry* ‘respect’, Corn. *bry* ‘respect, honour’, and also Gaul. **brigo-* ‘worth’ as reconstructable from Romance words (DLG 88; FEW 543; DTNG 153–154). IEW 476–477 compares the Insular Celtic words to Mod. Germ. *Krieg* from a potential PIE proto-form **g^wriHg^(h)-o-* (Kroonen 2013: 304–305; cf. also Zair 2012: 114). For some isolated forms in *brig-*, in which the length of the root vowel cannot be determined (e.g., *brigindoni* [GPN 314–316]), no decision can be made between this morpheme and *brig-*, but—despite the appealing metaphorical association—**brig-* with long *i* cannot, as suggested in EDPC 77–78, go back to the PIE root **b^herǵh-* which underlies *bríg-*.

marus, *brigouix*, *brigomaglos*, and hypocoristics, e.g., *brigios*, *brigia*, *brigionus* (RIG M-11) (KGP 156; GPN 314–316; Lochner von Hüttenbach 1989: 36; DLG 88; NPCEC 48), as well as toponyms like *brigomagus* (DCCPN 81; NLCEA 89). *Brīgs-*, much like simple *brīg-*, is not a personal name element, but occurs in toponyms, e.g., **brixīa* > *Brescia*, **brixinā* > *Brixen*, **brixis* > *Braye*, **brixellon* > *Brixlegg*, *Brescello* (Anreiter & Roider 2007: 105–106; DCCPN 83; NLCEA 89; DTNG 154) and associated ethnonyms, e.g., *brixenetes*. The function of *-s-* between base and derivational suffix (**brig-s-*) is unclear (cf. De Bernardo Stempel 1996: 116); the existence of an archaic *s*-stem **bʰr̥ǵʰ-s-ó-* ‘high’ in PIE and Celtic (***brig*sos) cannot be excluded (Stefan Höfler p. c., and cf. Repanšek 2018: 239 and NIL 33), but an attestation not anywhere but in a handful of Central European toponyms is not entirely likely. In any case, personal names with *brix-* are very rare, e.g., *brixa* (CIL xiii 4401), and probably derived from toponyms, e.g., *brixianus* (CIL v 4629 & ix 3588), theonym *brixantus* (CIL xiii 2812). **Brig-s-ī-* (or, indeed, **brīg-s-ī-*) is, therefore, unlikely to be either the first element of an abbreviated personal name or—to account for *-ī-*—an abbreviated simplex name like **brixios/-a* (an abbreviation which leaves out only one or two final letters not being plausible in any case). At most, an abbreviated **brixian°* derived from a toponym **brixīa* (personal name or literally ‘from Brixia’) may be feasible (cf. Verger 1998b: 287), but the lack of good personal name comparanda in combination with the doubtful reading of *san* makes a connection with **brig-* hard to maintain.

What should not be overlooked in this context, though, is Verger’s observation that the form might be connected with the name of the Bresse plain, which the settlement of Montmorot overlooks (1998a: 627²⁶ & 1998b: 287⁷³). As seen above, Verger’s comparanda are appropriate for a toponym, and a Mod. Fr. toponym *Bresse* can be derived from **brix°*, as demonstrated by *La Bresse* < *brixius* (*saltus*) (Vosges) (Anreiter & Roider 2007: 106)—though it must be observed that, while the prehistoric settlement at Montmorot was indeed situated on a hill, the Bresse plain is, in fact, a tectonic depression (but cf. LÉIA B-87). The questionable sound value of *san*, however, remains.

If *san* in the inscription denotes not (etymological) [ksj], but—as expected from (near-)contemporary Lepontic inscriptions—tau Gallicum or a pre-stage of it, a comparandum may be found in the personal name (gen.) *bristas* (nom. *bristā*) attested in a graffito from Limoges (RIG L-74) (Lejeune 1988: 114). The name has been connected with OIr. *bres* ‘fight, hit’ < **bristā*, MBret. MCorn. *bresel* ‘fight, war’ < **briste/ilo/ā*, etc., onomastically in the personal names OIr. *bresal* (arch. *bresuall*), OCorn. *combresel* < **(com-)bristoꝰalos*, Gaul. *combrissa* (CIL iii 14359²¹) (Hamp 1990; DLG 88–89; DTNG 155; Stifter 2019: 190). The etymology is not clear; OIr. *bres* is derived from the PIE root **bʰr̥eǵH-* ‘cut’ (**bʰr̥iH-st-ah₂-*) by IEW 166 (cf. also LÉIA B-85–86; Schrijver 1990; Hamp 1992: 218; Irslinger 2002: 420; Zair 2012: 157), but the retention of etymological /st/ is a surprising archaism.⁷ Whatever the exact PIE etymology, the base **brist-* contains a context for tau Gallicum and makes for a plausible first element of a compound personal name abbreviated to **prís**.

⁷ See Prósper 2019: 147–153 and Falileyev 2020: 12–17 for recent discussions of putative instances of preserved /st/.

2. NO·27 komeuioš | kalatikn | os (Dormelletto; second half of second century BCE)

I follow Gambari 2007: 256–258 in the reading, which appears to be unproblematic and can be largely verified on the photograph provided in Gambari 2011: 27 fig. 12. The text consists in a two-part onomastic formula with an individual name and a patronymic formed with the Gaulish suffix *-ikn-/-ign-* (see Russell 2013), presumably the name of a deceased person (unless the stone was a boundary marker as assumed by Gambari 2011: 27–28).

komeuioš finds no comparanda in Transalpine Gaul. The first element is most likely *kom-* ‘(together) with’, but the second element *eū(i)-* is unclear. Considering the date of the attestation (second half of the second century BCE: Spagnolo Garzoli 2007: 255; Gambari 2011: 27), inherited /ew/ should be expected to have become /ow/, though there are exceptions to this rule (Sims-Williams 2007: 313, and see below sub. 3. on *leuk-*). <e> might reflect monophthongised /aj/ (**aiu-* ‘lifeforce, lifetime’), but this development would be even more irregular.⁸ Gambari 2007: 257 suggests *aui-* ‘desire, wish’ (DLG 61; DTNG 95–97) → ‘he who shares the same desire’, comparing *comauī* (CIL v 7526; gen. sg.) and the British ethnonym *comauī*. Gaul. *aui-* is connected with the PIE root **h₂eū-* ‘enjoy’ (LIV² 274) by IEW 77–78; with *h₂* in the PIE root, /e/ instead of /a/ (as in the Breton variants: *eucant*, *eudon*, etc.) remains unexplained. If <eu> in **komeuioš** reflects retained inherited /ew/, the second element might be connected with PIE **h₁eūH-* ‘help, assist’ (LIV² 243), continued in Celtic in OIr. *-oí*, *-oat* ‘protect’: *kom-eū-īos*, but the root is not, to my knowledge, attested in Gaulish onomastics.

More rewarding is the patronymic **kalatiknos**, whose base could in principle be **kalat-* or **galat-*. Gambari 2007: 257 suggests *kal-et-* ‘hard, stern’ (OIr. *calad* etc.) as attested in Gaulish ethnonyms (e.g., *caletes*) and personal names (e.g., *caletius*: see EDPC 185; DLG 98; DTNG 173–174), which he derives from a base *kala-* ‘stone’, but cf. Joseph 1982: 40, who proposes an etymology PIE **k₁lH-et-o-* ‘cold’ (cf. Irslinger 2002: 46–47). All Gaulish attestations have *calet-* rather than *calat-*.⁹

I, therefore, prefer to read *galat-* (thus also Gambari 2011: 27), which can be identified directly with the ethnonym Gk. γαλάτης, pl. γαλάται,¹⁰ derived from a Celtic **galatis*, pl. **galates* ‘endowed with power’ with base **gal-* as in MIr. *gal* ‘valour, fighting spirit, fury’, MW *gal* ‘ferocity, hatred, enmity’ < PC **galā-* (EDPC 149). The existence of lexical **gal-* ‘power, ability’ in Gaulish is demonstrated by Mod. Fr. *gaillard* ‘strong, vigorous’ < Gallo-Lat. **galīa* ‘strength’.¹¹ These words are usually connected with the root of MW *gallu* ‘to be able; to take (away)’, OBret. *gal* ‘might, ability’ < PC **galnV-* < PIE **g₁-n(e)-H-* (EDPC 149–150) from the root **gelH-* ‘to gain power over something’ → **gelH-eh₂-* ‘power,

⁸ Cf. the Gaulish attestations *aiu*, *aiunus*, *aiuccio*, *aiulo*, etc. (DLG 36; KPP 2005: 213–214; NPCEC 2007: 16 & 210; Zeidler 2013).

⁹ VA·32 CALEDONOS (gen. sg.) (cf. CALEDV [RIG M–88–90]) is formed with a different suffix.

¹⁰ See McCone 2006: 94–96 for the history of attestation.

¹¹ Whether the suffix *-ī-* is Gallo-Latin or whether this formation was present in Gaulish is cannot be determined (FEW 30–31).

might', **gelH-ti-s* 'having power (over something), endowed with might/valour' (Schumacher 2000: 42 & 2004: 325; McCone 2006: 98; cf. also Irslinger 2002: 212). Schumacher 2000: 42 considers an alternative meaning of **galatis* 'marauder, thief' (either as a positively connotated endonym in the spirit of honourable raiding, or as a pejorative name given by an enemy tribe) based on the meaning 'get possession of' inherent in the root (Arm. *kalaw* 'took, snatched', W *gallu* also 'take [away]'). Alternative accounts of the etymology and exact semantics are proposed by Driessen 2003 and McCone 2006: 96–103. Driessen reconstructs a separate root **ǵ^helh₂-* 'to be furious' → **ǵ^h!h₂-eh₂-* 'fury' > **galā-*, while McCone identifies the root of **galā-* as **ǵ^helh₃-* 'yellow' and opts to also derive **galnV-* from it rather than from **gelH-* (arguing that light/fire, fury, and power/strength are all included in the concept of the furor heroicus). A merger of phonetically and semantically similar roots in PC **gal-* may certainly be considered; if the 'fury'-semantics of the Irish and Welsh nouns are projected back to a PIE root, such a meaning can also underlie the ethnonym ('endowed with battle fury').

Galatiknos could be based directly on the ethnic name **galatis* itself ('son of the Galatian') or on a derived personal name *galatos*, attested as the name of a Boian king in Polyb. ii 21.1–5 (died 225 BCE). Cf. KPP 195–196, where it is suggested that personal names like *gallus*, *gallius*, etc. are derived from the ethnonym *gallus*, pl. *galli*, but still carry the semantics of the appellative base; this may also be true of *galatos*. In the Cisalpine Celtic corpus, individual names derived from ethnonyms are attested in Etruscans *eluveitie* (ET² Pa 0.3) ← **el_ueiti_{jos}* 'Helvetian' and possibly in VA.6 *pelkui* (dat. sg.) ← **belgā* 'Belgian'.¹²

3. NO·28 aklušamo | ualos | leḡkur | uritu (Dormelletto; second half of second century BCE)

The reading again follows Gambari 2007: 258–259; no image is available in the literature, but the author expresses no reservations about the reading save in the case of the third letter in l. 3, for which, however, no alternative to upsilon is plausible. Gambari segments the text into two compound personal names, each taking up two lines, and interprets the second name as the individual name of the (putative) deceased (**leukuru-ritu**), the first name as a patronymic formed with the Lepontic suffix *-alo-* (**aklušamou-alos**). His analysis has the advantage of providing a patronymic for the expected two-part onomastic formula, even if it is irregularly situated in front of the individual name.

¹² Prosdocimi & Solinas 2017: 355–357 discuss the possibility that *belgos* is an ethnonym 'the Belgian', but, even if the base *belg-* is the same etymologically, the *o*-stem *belgos* must be a derived personal name, as the ethnonym *belgās* is an *ā*-stem (cf. De Bernardo Stempel 1999: 52³³). Etr. *eluveitie* fits the pattern of Etruscan names borrowed from IE names in the vocative (°(*i*)*e*) suggested by Stifter 2013: 49–52, which indicates an underlying Celtic name rather than an appellative (though the transfer to an inherited Etruscan *e*-stem class without influence from the IE vocative cannot be excluded; see De Simone 1970: 142 and Salomon 2020: 384–386).

Gambari's segmentation of **aklušamoualos**, however, leaves an irregular base, not *aklušamos*, as posited by Gambari, but implausible *aklušamoūs*. Equally unconvincing is the author's analysis of *aklušamo-* as a superlative adjective with base **akluo-*, interpreted as a variant of *akro-* 'high', which does not provide an explanation for the use of *san* instead of *sigma* in the superlative suffix. Both these problems can be circumvented by interpreting **aklušamoualos** not as a patronymic derived with *-alo-*, but as a compound individual name *aklušamo-ūalos*, with the line break at a morpheme boundary. The name can now be analysed as *ad-klut-samo-ūal-os* 'very most famous ruler'. The preverb *ad-* is used in intensifying function, with /d/ assimilated before the initial /k/ of *kluto-* 'famous'¹³ (as in CIL x 4876 *aclutius*; cf. KGP 110). The superlative suffix appears as *-samo-* rather than *-isamo-*;¹⁴ *san* thus denotes the cluster /ts/ or an outcome of the same (tau Gallicum; see Stifter 2010: 370 & 373–374) which emerged at the morpheme boundary between *klut-* and *-samo-*. The element *ūalo-* 'ruler, prince'¹⁵ is also attested in Cisalpine Celtic in the derivation *ūallaun-* < PC **ūal(l)amn-* in the name form **ūalaunal** (GR.1).

For **leukururitu**, Gambari aptly compares the Latin(ised) personal name VB.21 LEV.CVRO. The element *leukur-*, which most probably contains the base *le/ouko-* 'bright',¹⁶ is opaque. The appearance of the base spelled with <eu> rather than <ou> in both Cisalpine Celtic attestations (which could be due to influence from Latin spelling, which does not know <ou>, in LEV.CVRO, but hardly in the Lepontic alphabet) does not present an issue insofar as *le/ouk-* appears very frequently in the archaic (?) form *leuk-*; there are, so far, no instances of *louk-* in the Cisalpine Celtic corpus.¹⁷ More problematic aspects of the element are /u/ instead of regular /o/ as stem vowel, and an *r*-suffix which is otherwise unattested with this base—the latter may be adjectival *-ro*, but **leukururitu** lacks the suffix's stem vowel. Gambari, in whose analysis the second element of the compound is *ritu-/rito-* 'course, race, attack' (2007: 258–259),¹⁸ transcribes *leucuroritō* at 2011: 27, apparently assuming that <u> for the composition vowel is a spelling error (or /o/ > /u/ through assimilation?). While this solution is possible, the exact morphological make-up of the first element remains obscure. An alternative analysis is reached by following the example of *aklušamoūalos* and having the line break coincide with the

¹³ PIE **klu-tó-* 'heard of, famed'; see EDPC s.v. **kluto-*; LÉIA: C-124–125; Irslinger 2002: 263; DLG 119.

¹⁴ The suffix variant without /i/ can be due to syncope, or generalised from forms in **s-isam-*, where /i/ was regularly syncopeated (Stifter 2012: 256–257; Prósper 2018: 121–131).

¹⁵ PIE **u̯lH-o-* 'ruler'; see EDPC s.v. **walo-* and DLG 306.

¹⁶ PIE **leuk-o-* 'bright, shining'; see EDPC 145–146; KGP 231; GPN 358–359; DLG 200; NPCEC 116 & 224.

¹⁷ Also attested in Northern Italy is *leuconius* (Val Sabbia, CIL v 4902). KGP 231 remarks upon the frequency of forms with <eu> in the 'Illyrian' realm and suggests that the absence of rounding is due to substrate influence (cf. also KPP 274; Falileyev 2017: 422–424; Repanšek 2020: 59–60), but this does not account for the mixed distribution of the variants and for names attested with both spellings (e.g., the epithet of Mars *le/oucetius*).

¹⁸ PIE **rt-u-/rt-o-* 'running'; see Irslinger 2002: 18–19 & 148; KGP 259; GPN 249–251; Lochner von Hüttenbach 1989: 133–134; DLG 260; KPP 85–88.

morpheme boundary, which allows us to identify the second element as *urīto-* ‘found’.¹⁹ The name can, thus, be analysed as *leḡkur-urīt-ū* ‘the [?]-found one’.

How the two names relate to each other in the absence of a patronymic is unclear. *leḡkururītū*, a priori analysable as an *on*-stem, could be interpreted as the patronymic under the assumption that Cisalpine Celtic features a gen. sg. *-ū* < PIE abl. sg. **-ōd* which is used as a patronymic marker, as proposed by De Hoz 1990 and Lejeune 1989: 77 (critical, e.g., Eska 1995: 34–37).

4. VR·7 ΑΤΕΡΟΡΙΧ (Santa Maria di Zevio; first century BCE)

The compound personal name ΑΤΕΡΟΡΙΧ, here inscribed in the Latin alphabet, is also attested in Strabo and in Galatia (gen. sg. ατερορειχος; see KGP 138), and possibly in RIG G-28]πορειξ. The third element is *rīg-* ‘ruler’; *atepo-*, also attested in Cisalpine Celtic in the hypocoristics TI·8 *atepu* and VA·2 *atepa*, can be analysed as *at(e)-epo-* → *ateporix* ‘great horse-king’,²⁰ or *ad-tepo-* ‘run towards’. The latter analysis is suggested for *atepomarus* by DLG 57, which compares OIr. *ad·teich* ‘turn to someone, appeal to someone’ and the personal name *teponia* ‘runner’, and supported more elaborately by KPP 94–97 sub *atpomarus* (CIL iii 4580).

KPP considers *at(e)-epo-* formally possible and does not exclude that the name could be analysed and understood thus synchronically, but points out that unprefixated ***epomarus*, ***eporix* without intensifying *ate-* are unattested, and that CIL xiii 1318 *atepomarus* ‘very great in horses’ does not seem an obvious epithet for Apollo (pace Stüber 2005: 105). It suggests a meaning ‘attack’ or possibly ‘running to someone’s aid’ with regard to the epithet (cf. the Greek epithet of Apollo βοηδρόμιος ‘who comes running to help’), and translates *ateporix* ‘king of attacks’ (‘Angriffskönig’, comparing *riturix* with similar semantics), or ‘king who comes running to aid (in battle)’. Though KPP admits that the semantics of **(at)tek^w-* in Insular Celtic (OIr. *techid* ‘flee, escape, retreat’, *ad·teich* ‘turn to someone, appeal to someone’, MW *techu*, MBret. *techet*, Corn. *têgh* ‘flee’; LÉIA: T-40; Schumacher 2004: 629–631; EDPC 377) do not agree with its more aggressive interpretations, it prefers the latter with regard to the ‘heroischen Charakter dieser Namen’. In view of the ‘flight’-semantics of the Insular Celtic continuations of **tek^w-* ‘run’, however, an interpretation of *atepo-* as ‘refuge’ as in OIr. *attach* ‘refuge’ may be preferable; David Stifter points out to me that a name ‘refuge king’, which emphasises the protective function of kingship, finds an excellent comparandum in OW *uoteporix* (CIIC i 358) with W *godeb* ‘refuge’ as first element (cf. Sims-Williams 2003: 54).

¹⁹ PIE **urē-to-* ‘found’; see Irslinger 2002: 252; KGP 301; GPN 388–389; DLG 329; Stüber, Zehnder, & Remmer 2009: 266.

²⁰ Thus ACS i 256; Lejeune 1971: 61; KGP 138; GPN 52–53 with previous literature; Motta 2000: 210.

5. VA·16 akešī (Arsago Seprio; late first century BCE)

For **akešī**, CI ii 116 compares VC·1.2 **akisios**, which differs in both the root vowel /e/ vs. /i/ and the spelling of the sibilant <ś> vs. <s>. A more accurate comparandum can be found when reading san with the sound value /d/, as can be argued for a number of inscriptions from predominantly the late Lepontic phase (Stifter 2010: 372–373 sub H). The form can then be analysed as *agedī*, a genitive singular in *-ī* of a masculine personal name *agedos* or *agedios* (with kappa for /g/). An onomastic element *aged^o* is attested in Gaulish names like RIG M-177 *agedomapatīs* (gen. sg.), M-93 *caliaged*, M-14 *αγεδ[*, *agedouirus*, *aged(i)us*, *agedillus*, *agedilios*, *agedinius*, etc.; *agedi* (gen. sg.) appears in CIL ii 5747 & 6257⁹ (both from Spain) (DLG 34; NPCEC 14; DTNG 33–34). The element is connected with OIr. *agad* ‘face’ (also ‘reputation’) by ACS i 55 (also LG 224; KPP 213; DCCPN 5), for which LÉIA A-23–24 suggests a derivation from the root *ag-* ‘drive, lead’ < PIE **h₂eǵ-* ‘drive’ via ‘conduct, attitude’, in which case Gaulish *aged-* could be ‘manner, appearance’, as well as ‘face’ (DLG 34: *agedomapas* ‘childlike’, *agedouirus* ‘of honest aspect’; cf. KGP 118). The genitive singular of the Old Irish form *aigthe*, however, indicates that the preform had /t/, which makes the connection with Gaul. *aged-* difficult (cf. Hertz apud KGP 118).²¹

6. BG·36.1/BG·36.2 ACETABLA VIII | TAI (Verdello; 20–1 BCE)

The two sequences ACETABLA VIII | TAI are inscribed on a terra sigillata cup (type Goudineau 2) found in tomb 16 of the Colabiolo section of the Verdello necropolis.²² The cup bears the stamp PASSI | TELAM of Passius Telamo, whose workshop was located in the Padan plain and who was active between 20 and 1 BCE (OCK 1380); this dating agrees with the terminus post quem 23 BCE for the grave, which is determined by a coin find (Fortunati & Corti 2003: 172). In the same grave was found a second cup of similar type and size and with the same stamp, bearing the inscription CILO (BG·35). ACETABLA VIII (BG·36.1) is written upside-down on the wall of the cup, TAI (BG·36.2) on the foot of the cup near the rim. Both inscriptions are dextroverse and written in the same alphabet, namely the Latin one with cursive features in epsilon, lambda and alpha—they belong together and are very probably from the same hand (Morandi 2003: 131).

The short sequence TAI can be compared with numerous two- and three-letter sequences on late Cisalpine Celtic pottery, which are usually interpreted as abbreviations of personal names (Morandi 2007: 301 no. 33), though the ending in *o* also allows for an

²¹ CI’s comparison with **akisios** may still be valid, as there exist a number of variants whose relation to each other is unclear. GPN 131–132 lists potential Irish cognates for *aged-*, but points to *ages-* (*agesillus*), *agid-* (*agidillus*), *agis-* (*agisillus*), *aced-* (*acedillus*, *ac[ed]omapatīs*), *acid-* (*acidus*), *acis-* (*acisillia*, *acisius*), *acit-*, and doubts that a discreet Gaulish element *aged-* existed. *Acito-*, a toponymic element (*acitodunum*, *acitorigiacon*), is kept separate by DLG 31 and translated as ‘plain’ (OIr. *ached*); cf. also Villar & Prósper 2005: 271³³⁵.

²² See Jorio 2003: 205 with n. 5 for the classification of the cup, and Fortunati & Corti 2003: 172–173 for details about the grave and its inventory.

interpretation as a genitive singular (Morandi 2003: 131 no. 12; CI 293). The name may be Celtic, but—as with CILo from the same grave—good comparanda for a base *tai-* or *dai-* are rare (for *dai-*, cf. DTNG 273). Morandi 2003: 131 no. 12, compares *taius* listed in ACS ii 1706, specifically CIL v 4670 *l. petronius tai f.* from Brescia (Untermann 1959: 138 with n. 34).²³ If the form is a genitive singular, *-ī* may be Latin as well as Celtic.

More unusual is the Latin plural *acetabula* ‘vinegar bowls’ (with syncope in the fourth syllable, as also attested in the Transalpine Gaulish loan *acitabli*),²⁴ followed by the numeral ‘8’. The cup could qualify as an acetabulum, though one on the larger side; the typical indented wall profile is absent. Morandi 2003: 131 suggests that the cup is one of eight such vessels deposited in the grave at the burial, though—as he himself points out—only two cups were found in the intact grave. Also mentioned, but judged irrelevant by Morandi (also CI 293; Morandi 2007: 301 no. 33) is the similarity of the whole document, including the probably onomastic TAI, with entries in the pottery lists of the Gaulish terra sigillata production centre La Graufesenque, which include the potter’s name, the type of manufactured vessel in the plural, and the number of vessels—cf. particularly GLG 13.13: *masueto acitabli VII D* ‘Masueto: 7500 acetabula’ and nos 163–168 as well as RIG L-30l, L-30o, & *L-35.5. The latter consist in only one potter’s name, or only objects and numbers, and can be interpreted as production notes delivered with the manufactured pieces from which the ultimate lists were compiled (cf. Mullen, forthcoming: 146–147), e.g., *L-35.5 *aricani parab(sides) V*].

Pottery lists from Italian production centres are only attested sporadically, possibly because they were written on perishable materials (cf. Mullen, forthcoming: 151–152 with a list of potential examples, and esp. Camodeca 2006), but the present document finds its best comparanda in this text type. How it found its way into a grave is open to conjecture—were notes and lists written on damaged goods which could then be sold off cheaply? Were thus used objects considered waste which could be taken home by the potters? Was the writing considered a value-increasing feature by illiterate owners, did literate ones not mind the random inscription—or was the deceased (probably a male of 20–30 years; Cattaneo, Ravedoni, & Salvadei 2003: 220–221) the potter?

ABBREVIATIONS

ACS	=	Holder 1896–1907
CD	=	Falileyev 2009
CI	=	Morandi 2004
CIIC	=	Macalister 1945–1949

²³ Cf. also CIL v 5567 *taiei f.* (Gallarate), 6766 *taia* (Ciliano), 7741 *taietius* (San Margherita/Rapallo) and 5199 *dai f.* (Clusone), as well as Venetic Es 12 *tainon* [LV ii 169]. ACS ii 1705 further has attestations from Vienne, Bloye and Saint-Germain (Albens), and *taietionis* is attested at Maria Saal (CIL iii 4784, Noricum). Untermann 1958: 185–186 suggests for the ‘Ligurian’ attestations *taia* and *taienius* that intervocalic /j/ may go back to *-gj-*, in which case the names could be connected with the base *dag-* ‘good’.

²⁴ The Gaulish loan is inflected as a masculine; see Adams 2003: 700–701.

CIL	=	Mommsen et al. 1862–
DCCPN	=	Falileyev 2010
DLG	=	Delamarre 2018
DTNG	=	Delamarre 2019
EDPC	=	Matasović 2009
ET ²	=	Meiser 2014
FEW	=	Wartburg 1922–2002
GLG	=	Marichal 1988
GPN	=	Evans 1967
IEW	=	Pokorny 1959–1969
KGP	=	Schmidt 1957
KPP	=	Meid 2005
LÉIA	=	Vendryes, Bachellery, & Lambert 1959–
LexLep	=	Stifter, Braun, Salomon, Michela Vignoli, et al. 2009–
LG	=	Dottin 1920
LIV ²	=	Rix, Kümmel, et al. 2001
LV	=	Pellegrini & Prosdocimi 1967
NIL	=	Wodtko, Irslinger, & Schneider 2008
NLCEA	=	Delamarre 2012
NPCEC	=	Delamarre 2007
OCK	=	Oxé, Comfort, & Kenrick 2000
RIG G	=	Lejeune 1985
RIG L	=	Lambert 2002
RIG M	=	Colbert de Beaulieu & Fischer 1998

References

- Adams, James N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anreiter, Peter, & Ulrike Roider. 2007. Quelques noms de lieux d'origine celtique dans les Alpes orientales (tout particulièrement en Autriche). In Lambert & Pinault 2007: 99–125.
- Camodeca, Giuseppe. 2006. Graffito con conto di infornata di sigillata tardo-italica da Isola di Migliarino (Pisa). In *Territorio e produzioni ceramiche. Paesaggi, economia e società in età romana. Atti del convegno internazionale, Pisa, 20–22 ottobre 2005*, ed. Simonetta Menchelli & Marinella Pasquinucci, 207–216. Pisa: Università di Pisa.
- Cattaneo, Cristina, Cristina Ravedoni & Loretana Salvadei. 2003. Analisi antropologiche sui resti scheletrici. In Fortunati, Pagani, & Poggiani Keller 2003: 217–222.
- Colbert de Beaulieu & Brigitte Fischer. 1998. *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises iv, Les légendes monétaires*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- De Bernardo Stempel, Patrizia. 1995–1996. Tratti linguistici comuni ad appellativi e toponimi di origine celtica in Italia. *Travaux de linguistique et de philologie* 33–34: 109–136.
- . 1999. *Nominale Wortbildung des älteren Irischen. Stammbildung und Derivation*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

- De Hoz, Javier. 1990. El genitivo celtico de los temas en -o-. In *Studia indogermanica et palaeohispanica in honorem Antonio Tovar et Luis Michelena*, ed. Francisco Villar, 315–329. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- . 1994. Castellum Aviliobris. Los celtas del extremo occidente continental. In *Indogermanica et Caucasia. Festschrift für Karl Horst Schmidt zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Roland Bielmeier & Reinhard Stempel, 348–362. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.
- Delamarre, Xavier. 2007. *Noms de personnes celtiques dans l'épigraphie classique. Nomina celtica antiqua selecta inscriptionum*. Paris: Errance.
- . 2012. *Noms de lieux celtiques de l'Europe ancienne (-500/+500). Dictionnaire*. Arles: Errance.
- . 2018. *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise. Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*³. Paris: Errance.
- . 2019. *Dictionnaire des thèmes nominaux du gaulois. Index des thèmes de l'onomastique celtique ancienne établis d'après les noms de personnes, de dieux, de peuples, de lieux et de rivières. Approche morphologique et sémantique i, Ab-/Ixs(o)-*. Paris: Les Cent Chemins.
- De Simone, Carlo. 1970. *Die griechischen Entlehnungen im Etruskischen ii, Untersuchung*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Dottin, Georges. 1920. *La langue gauloise. Grammaire, textes et glossaire*. Paris: C. Klincksieck.
- Driessen, C. Michiel. 2003. Evidence for *ǵʰelh₂-, a new Indo-European root. *Journal of Indo-European studies* 31: 279–305.
- Eska, Joseph F. 1995. Observations on the thematic genitive singular in Lepontic and Hispano-Celtic. In *Hispano-Gallo-Brittonica. Essays in honour of Professor D. Ellis Evans on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*, ed. Joseph F. Eska, R. Geraint Gruffydd, & Nicolas Jacobs, 33–46. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- . 1998a. The linguistic position of Lepontic. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society. Special session on Indo-European subgrouping and internal relations*, ed. Benjamin K. Bergin, Madelaine C. Plauché, & Ashlee C. Bailey, 2–11. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- . 1998b. PIE *p > Ø in proto-Celtic. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 58: 63–80.
- . 2017. Phonological contrasts and character reduction in the alphabet of Lugano. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 64: 59–80.
- Evans, D. Ellis. 1967. *Gaulish personal names. A study of some Continental Celtic formations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Falileyev, Alexander. 2009. *Celtic Dacia. Personal names, place-names and ethnic names of Celtic origin in Dacia and Scythia Minor*. Aberystwyth: CMCS.
- . 2010. *Dictionary of Continental Celtic place-names. A Celtic companion to the Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman world*. Aberystwyth: CMCS.
- . 2017. Divine names from Latin inscriptions of Istria. Some considerations. In *Celtic religions in the Roman period. Personal, local, and global*, ed. Ralph Haeussler & Anthony King, 419–439. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications.
- . 2020. 'Celtic' commentaries on four Roman military diplomas. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 67: 1–22.
- Fortunati, Maria, & Paolo Corti. 2003. La necropoli nell'area del Colabiolo. Lo scavo del 1996. In Fortunati, Pagani, & Poggianai Keller 2003: 157–173.
- , Lelio Pagani, & Raffaella Poggiani Keller (eds.). 2003. *Verdello. Dalle origini all'altomedioevo. Ricerche archeologiche e storiche*. Verdello: Comune di Verdello.
- Gambari, Filippo M. 2007. Dormelletto. I documenti epigrafici in celtico cisalpino. *Quaderni della Soprintendenza Archeologica del Piemonte* 22: 256–259.

- . 2011. Le pietre dei signori del fiume. Il cippo iscritto e le stele del primo periodo della cultura di Golasecca. In *L'alba della città. Le prime necropoli del centro protourbano di Castelletto Ticino*, ed. Filippo Maria Gambari & Raffaella Cerri, 19–32. Novara: Interlinea.
- , & Giovanni Colonna. 1986 [1988]. Il bicchiere con iscrizione arcaica da Castelletto Ticino e l'adozione della scrittura nell'Italia nord-occidentale. *Studi etruschi* 54: 119–164.
- Hamp, Eric P. 1990. Varia. XLIV. Limoges BRISTAS. *Études celtiques* 27: 182–183.
- . 1991–1992. British Celtic BRIGE and morphology. *Studia Celtica* 26/27: 9–11.
- . 1992. Gaulish *sunartiu*. 3. Postscript on IE syllabic sonants. *Études celtiques* 29: 217–220.
- Holder, Alfred. 1896–1907. *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Irslinger, Britta Sofie. 2002. *Abstrakta mit Dentalsuffixen im Altirischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Jorio, Stefania. 2003. La terra sigillata. In Fortunati, Pagani, & Poggiani Keller 2003: 205–208.
- Joseph, Lionel S. 1982. The treatment of *CRH- and the origin of CaRa- in Celtic. *Ériu* 33: 31–57.
- Kroonen, Guus. 2013. *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 2002. *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises ii/2, Textes gallo-latins sur instrumentum*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- , & George-Jean Pinault (eds.). 2007. *Gaulois et celtique continental*. Genève: Droz.
- Lejeune, Michel. 1971. *Lepontica*. Paris: Société d'Édition «Les Belles Lettres».
- . 1985. *Recueil des inscriptions gauloises i, Textes gallo-grecs*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- . 1988. Textes gaulois et gallo-romains en cursive latine. *Études celtiques* 25: 107–115.
- . 1989 [1990]. Notes de linguistique italique. xxxix. Génitifs en -osio et génitifs en -i. *Revue des études latines* 67: 63–77.
- Lochner von Hüttenbach, Fritz. 1989. *Die römerzeitlichen Personennamen der Steiermark*. Graz: Leykam.
- Luján, Eugenio R. 2003. Gaulish personal names, An update. *Études celtiques* 35: 181–247.
- Macalister, R. A. S. 1945–1949. *Corpus inscriptionum insularum Celticarum*. Dublin: Stationery Office.
- Maras, Daniele F. 2014. Breve storia della scrittura celtica d'Italia. L'area Golasecciana. *Zixu. Studi sulla cultura celtica di Golasecca* 1: 73–93.
- Marichal, Robert. 1988. *Les graffites de la Graufesenque*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Matasović, Ranko. 2009. *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden: Brill.
- McCone, Kim. 2006 [2008]. Greek Κελτός and Γαλάτης, Latin *Gallus*. *Die Sprache* 46: 94–111.
- Meid, Wolfgang. 2005. *Keltische Personennamen in Pannonien*. Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- Meiser, Gerhard. 2014. *Etruskische Texte. Editio minor*². Hamburg: Baar.
- Mommsen, Theodor, et al. 1862–. *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin: Reimer/De Gruyter.
- Morandi, Alessandro. 2003. Le iscrizioni vascolari galliche e romane. In Fortunati, Pagani, & Poggiani Keller 2003: 123–137.
- . 2004. *Celti d'Italia ii, Epigrafia e lingua dei Celti d'Italia*. Roma: Spazio Tre.
- . 2007. Bergamo e centri minori. Epigrafia vascolare-strumentale celtica e romana. In *Storia economica e sociale di Bergamo. I primi millenni—dalla preistoria al medioevo*, ed. Maria Fortunati & Raffaella Poggiani Keller, i 287–305. Bergamo: Fondazione per la Storia economica e sociale di Bergamo.
- Motta, Filippo. 2000. La documentazione epigrafica e linguistica. In *I Leponti tra mito e realtà*, ed. Raffaele C. de Marinis & Simonetta Biaggio Simona, 181–222. Locarno: Gruppo Archeologia Ticino.
- Mullen, Alex. Forthcoming. Transformations de la Gaule sous l'Empire romain. Une culture de l'écrit au service de la production de masse. In *La culture de l'écrit en Méditerranée occidentale à travers les pratiques épigraphiques*, ed. Michèle Coltelloni-Trannoy & Noemí Moncunill Martí, 131–162. Leuven.

- Oxé, August, Howard Comfort & Philip Kenrick. 2000. *Corpus vasorum Arretinorum. A catalogue of the signatures, shapes and chronology of Italian sigillata²*. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt.
- Pellegrini, G. B., & A. L. Prodocimi. 1967. *La lingua ventica*. Padova: Istituto di glottologia dell'Università / [Firenze]: Circolo linguistico fiorentino.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1959–1969. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: A. Francke.
- Prodocimi, Aldo Luigi, & Patrizia Solinas. 2017. Epigrafia e linguistica preromana. In *Il territorio di Varese in età preistorica e protostorica*, ed. Maurizio Harari, 339–363. Busto Arsizio: Nomos Edizioni.
- Prósper, Blanca María. 2018. The Indo-European personal names of Pannonia, Noricum and Northern Italy. Comparative and superlative forms in Celtic, Venetic, and South-Picene. *Voprosy onomastiki* 15/2: 108–138.
- . 2019 [2020]. Celtic and Venetic in contact. The dialectal attribution of the personal names in the Venetic record. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 66: 131–176.
- Repanšek, Luka. 2018. Review of Tat'jana Andreevna Mikhajlova, *Gall'skij jazyk. Učebnye materialy*, Moskva: MAKSS Press 2016. *Journal of Celtic linguistics* 19: 229–241.
- . 2020. *Loucita*. Etymological notes on a female name from the Norico-Pannonian onomastic landscape. *Voprosy onomastiki* 17/3, 51–64.
- Rix, Helmut. 1997. Germanische Runen und venetische Phonetik. In *Vergleichende germanische Philologie und Skandinavistik. Festschrift für Otmar Werner*, ed. Thomas Birkmann, Heinz Klingenberg, Damaris Nübling, & Elke Ronneberger-Sibold, 231–248. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer.
- , Martin Kümmel, et al. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen²*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
- Russell, Paul. 2013. From compound to derivative. The development of a patronymic «suffix» in Gaulish. In *Continental Celtic word formation. The onomastic data*, ed. Juan Luis García Alonso, 201–214. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- Salomon, Corinna. 2020. Some remarks on the personal name system of Raetic. *Namenkundliche Informationen* 112: 375–408.
- Schmidt, Karl Horst. 1957. Die Komposition in gallischen Personennamen. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 26: 33–301.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1990. Latin *festināre*, Welsh *brys*. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 51: 243–247.
- Schumacher, Stefan. 2000. *The historical morphology of the Welsh verbal noun*. Maynooth: Department of Old Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- . 2004. *Die keltischen Primärverben. Ein vergleichendes, etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Sims-Williams, Patrick. 2003. *The Celtic inscriptions of Britain. Phonology and chronology, c. 400–1200*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 2007. Common Celtic, Gallo-Brittonic and Insular Celtic. In Lambert & Pinault 2007: 309–354.
- Solinas, Patrizia. 1994 [1995]. Il celtico in Italia. *Studi etruschi* 60: 311–408.
- Spagnolo Garzoli, Giuseppina. 2007. Dormelletto. Necropoli celtica e epigrafe figurata. *Quaderni della Soprintendenza Archeologica del Piemonte* 22: 254–256.
- Stifter, David. 2010. Lepontische Studien. *Lexicon Leponticum* und die Funktion von *san* im Lepontischen. In *Akten des 5. Deutschsprachigen Keltologensymposiums. Zürich, 7.–10. September 2009*, ed. Karin Stüber, Thomas Zehnder, & Dieter Bachmann, 361–376. Wien: Praesens.
- . 2011. The textual arrangement of Alise-Sainte-Reine (L-13). *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 58: 165–181.
- . 2012. On the linguistic situation of Roman-period Ig. In *Personal names in the western Roman world. Proceedings of a workshop convened by Torsten Meißner, José Luis García Ramón and Paolo Poccetti, held at Pembroke College, Cambridge, 16–18 September 2011*, ed. Torsten Meißner, 247–265. Berlin: Curach Bhán.

- . 2013. Vocative for nominative. In *Vocative! Addressing between system and performance*, ed. Barbara Sonnenhauser & Patrizia Noel Aziz Hanna, 43–85. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- . 2019. An apple a day . . . *Indogermanische Forschungen* 124: 171–218.
- . 2020. Cisalpine Celtic. In *Proceedings of the International Conference 'Palaeoeuropean languages and epigraphic cultures. Challenges and research approaches' (Rome, March 13–15, 2019)*, ed. Francisco Beltrán Lloris, Borja Díaz Ariño, María José Estarán Tolosa, & Carlos Jordán Cólera, i 335–365. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico. (= *Palaeohispanica* 20).
- , Martin Braun, Corinna Salomon, Michela Vignoli et al. 2009–. *Lexicon Leponticum*. On-line at <https://lexlep.univie.ac.at> (accessed 10 August 2021).
- Stüber, Karin. 2005. *Schmied und Frau. Studien zur gallischen Epigraphik und Onomastik*. Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- , Thomas Zehnder, & Ulla Remmer. 2009. *Indogermanische Frauennamen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Tibiletti Bruno, Maria Grazia. 1981. Le iscrizioni celtiche d'Italia. In *I Celti d'Italia*, ed. Enrico Campanile, 157–207. Pisa: Giardini.
- Uhlich, Jürgen. 2007. More on the linguistic classification of Lepontic. In Lambert & Pinault 2007: 373–411.
- Untermann, Jürgen. 1958. Zu einigen Personennamen auf lateinischen Inschriften in Ligurien. In *Sybaris. Festschrift Hans Krahe zum 60. Geburtstag am 7. Februar 1958 dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen*, 177–188. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- . 1959. Namenlandschaften im alten Oberitalien [part 1]. *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 10: 75–159.
- Vendryes, Joseph, Édouard Bachellery, & Pierre-Yves Lambert. 1959–. *Lexique etymologique de l'irlandais ancien*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies / Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Verger, Stéphane. 1998a. Note sur un graffite archaïque provenant de l'habitat hallstattien de Montmorot (Jura). *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 142: 619–632.
- . 1998b. Un graffite archaïque dans l'habitat hallstattien de Montmorot (Jura, France). *Studi etruschi* 64: 265–316.
- Villar, Francisco, & Blanca María Prósper. 2005. *Vascos, Celtas e Indoeuropeos. Genes y lenguas*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- Wartburg, Walther von. 1922–2003. *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes*. Bonn: Schroeder.
- Whatmough, Joshua. 1933. *The prae-Italic dialects of Italy ii, The Raetic, Lepontic, Gallic, East-Italic, Messapic and Sicel inscriptions*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Wodtke, Dagmar S., Britta Irslinger, & Carolin Schneider. 2008. *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Zair, Nicholas. 2012. *The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Celtic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Zeidler, Jürgen. 2013. Celtic *aiṷ- 'lifetime, life-force'. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 60: 275–280.